

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TREVOR JOHNSON,  
Petitioner,

v.

DOMINGO URIBE,  
Respondent.

No. SACV 09-1152 CBM (VBK)

ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS OF UNITED  
STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, the Court has reviewed the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (“Petition”), the records and files herein, the First Amended Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge, and the Petitioner’s Complete Statement of Objections with Declaration and Points and Authorities attached to Petitioner’s Motion filed on February 27, 2012.

After a *de novo* review of Petitioner’s Complete Statement of Objections with Declaration and Points and Authorities, the Court overrules the objections because the topics addressed are covered in the First Amended Report and Recommendation, which the Court adopts. The objections do not change the First Amended Report and Recommendation’s findings. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C)

1 (“A judge of the court shall make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the  
 2 [magistrate judge’s] report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to  
 3 which objection is made.”); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121  
 4 (9th Cir. 2003) (“The statute makes it clear that the district judge must review the  
 5 magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations *de novo* if objection is made,  
 6 but not otherwise.”).

7 **IT IS ORDERED** that: (1) the Court accepts the findings and  
 8 recommendations of the Magistrate Judge; (2) the Court declines to issue a  
 9 Certificate of Appealability (“COA”)<sup>1</sup>; (3) the Second Amended Petition is  
 10 denied; (4) Petitioner’s First Amended Motion for Summary Judgment and any  
 11 and all other pending motions or requests are denied; and (5) this case is dismissed  
 12 with prejudice.



13  
 14  
 15 DATED: April 17, 2012

16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28  
 Consuelo B. Marshall  
 Senior United States District Judge

<sup>1</sup> Under 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2), a COA may issue “only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.” The Supreme Court has held that, to obtain a Certificate of Appealability under § 2253(c), a habeas petitioner must show that “reasonable jurists could debate whether (or, for that matter, agree that) the petition should have been resolved in a different manner or that the issues presented were ‘adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further’.” *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 483-484, 120 S.Ct. 1595 (2000) (internal quotation marks omitted); *see also Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 336, 123 S. Ct. 1029 (2003). After review of Petitioner’s contentions herein, this Court concludes that Petitioner has not made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right, as is required to support the issuance of a COA.